

Amendments to the Drawing

The attached sheet includes a replacement drawing to replace original drawing sheet 1. In the Figure, the location of element 25 has been moved.

Attachments: 1 Replacement Sheet
1 Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on December 28, 2007, the specification was objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 for containing non-idiomatic expression. Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 as being indefinite. Applicants thank the Examiner for noting that claims 1-23 appear to contain allowable subject matter.

Amendments to Claims

Upon entry of this paper, claims 1-23 will be pending and under consideration. Claims 1-8, 10-11, 17, and 22 have been amended to correct matters of form and translational errors. Support for the amendments to claims 1-8, 10-11, 17, and 22 can be found in the original application as filed at least at page 1, ¶ 2; page 4, ¶ 3; page 5, ¶ 2; page 7, ¶¶ 6-8; page 8, ¶¶ 4, 6 and 9; page 10, ¶ 6; page 13, ¶¶ 2-6; and the Figure. No new matter has been introduced.

Amendments to the Specification

Applicants have amended the specification at page 2, ¶ 1; page 3, ¶ 1; page 4, ¶ 3; page 5, ¶¶ 1 and 5; page 7, ¶ 7; page 8, ¶¶ 1 and 9; and page 13, ¶ 6. The specification has been amended to correct translational errors and to correct matters of form. For example, in the enclosed substitute specification, the phrases “clock,” “clock time,” “cycle clock,” and “cycle clock time” have been amended to “cycle time” to provide consistency in terminology and to correct translational errors. Support for these amendments can be found at least at page 1, ¶¶ 2 and 4; page 2, ¶ 1; page 5, ¶ 2; page 8, ¶ 9; and the original claims.

In addition, Applicants have added a section entitled “Cross-Reference to Related Applications” on page 1, to include reference to the related applications noted on the filing receipt. Applicants have replaced the section header “Background of the Invention” with “Field of the Invention” on page 1, and added a section header “Background of the Invention” at the bottom of page 1. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been introduced into the specification.

Amendments to the Drawing

Applicants have amended the drawing to move the location of reference number 25. In the originally-filed drawing, reference number 25 was mislabeled. The amended drawing corrects this error. Support can be found at least at page 13, ¶ 4 and page 14. No new matter has been introduced.

In view of the amendments to the specification and claims, together with the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of objection and rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 Objections

The specification was objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 for containing non-idiomatic expressions. In particular, the Examiner objected to “clock with” on page 4, ¶ 3 and “cycle clock” on page 7, ¶ 7 and page 8, ¶ 9. To address the Examiner’s objections, both phrases have been removed and replaced with the term “cycle time” to clarify the meaning of the “clock.” Applicants believe that these amendments address and cure all of the Examiner’s objections to the specification.

In addition, the Examiner objected to the Figure. First, the Examiner objected to reference number 25 as appearing to represent a different element in the Figure than described in the specification. Second, the Examiner did not understand the meaning of reference number 24. In response, Applicants have amended the Figure by moving reference number 25 to the correct location, as supported at least by page 13, ¶ 5 and page 14 of the originally-filed specification. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that reference number 24 is a “processing unit,” as described on page 14 of the original application. Applicants believe that the amendment to the Figure addresses the Examiner’s concerns with respect to the Figure. As a result, Applicants request that the objections to the Figure and Specification be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 Rejections

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

First, the Examiner rejected claim 1, line 2 and claim 17, line 2 for reciting the expression “in particular a light molten metal.” Applicants have cancelled this expression in claims 1 and 17, and thus request that this rejection of claims 1 and 17 be withdrawn.

Second, the Examiner rejected claim 1, last 5 lines; claim 4, last two lines; claim 8, last two lines; and claim 17, last two lines because the meaning of the claims allegedly is not clear. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 8, and 17 by replacing “clock” with “cycle time.” Support can be found in the original application at least at page 1, ¶ 2 (“The invention also relates to a method for the production of cast parts . . . which takes place in a continuous cycle”) and at page 3, ¶ 1 (“the large number of complex machine units and the compulsion to run clock times of less than 60 seconds entails long set-up times and complex assembly work which, in turn, cause availability losses”). Applicants believe that this amendment further clarifies these claims and addresses the Examiner’s concerns. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 rejections of claims 1, 4, 8, and 12 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Third, the Examiner noted that there allegedly is no controlling apparatus linking between the core making machine and the demoulding unit. As such, the Examiner alleged that it is not clear how the operations of the core making machine and the demoulding unit are related to each other. Applicants respectfully disagree. The core making machine (i.e., core production unit 2) is coupled to mould assembly unit 3 by, for example, assembly robot 11. See, e.g., page 11, ¶ 4 and the Figure. Assembly unit 3 is coupled to casting unit 4 by, for example, conveying device 12. See, e.g., page 11, ¶ 5 to page 12, ¶ 1 and the Figure. Casting unit 4 is coupled to demoulding unit 5b by, for example conveyor section 20. See, e.g., page 12, ¶ 5 to page 13, ¶ 1 and the Figure.

Accordingly, the core making machine (i.e., core production unit 2) is related to the demoubling unit 5b by the mould assembly unit 3 and the casting unit 4. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Fourth, the Examiner rejected claim 15 because the Examiner alleged that it is not clear what a “movement device” is. Applicants respectfully disagree. A “movement device” is defined on page 10, ¶ 1 of the original specification as a device for “moving the casting mould immersed into the basin” in the demoulding unit. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would recognize that a “movement device” is used to move (e.g., agitate) the casting mould in the liquid basin. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Fifth, the Examiner rejected claim 22 because the expression of “binding . . . is cancelled” is allegedly non-idiomatic. In response, Applicants have amended the claim to remove the expression “binding . . . is cancelled.” As a result, Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 rejection of claim 22 be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention, and request that all of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 rejections to the claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims and specification are in condition for allowance and requests early favorable action. Applicants authorize the Commissioner to charge any necessary fee to maintain the pendency of this application to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-3081. The Examiner is welcome to contact Applicants' attorney at the number below with any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 24, 2008
Reg. No.: 55,699

Tel. No.: (617) 526-9836
Fax No.: (617) 526-9899


Deborah Vernon
Attorney for the Applicants
Proskauer Rose LLP
One International Place
Boston, MA 02110-2600

ANNOTATED SHEET

